

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 143

HE 011 957

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.  
TITLE The Development of Competence: Administrative Needs and Training Goals in American Higher Education.  
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.  
PUB DATE 78  
NOTE 45p.  
  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Accountability: Administrative Change;  
\*Administrative Personnel: Administrator Education;  
\*Administrator Role: Change Strategies; \*College Administration: \*Competence: Higher Education;  
\*Middle Management: Needs Assessment; \*Professional Development: Staff Improvement: Surveys

## ABSTRACT

The demand, supply, sponsorship, and need for staff development and training activities for middle level college administrators is examined through interviews with nearly 200 administrators and faculty at 20 colleges and universities, and a review of the literature. It is explained that middle level staff serve three functions--as liaison with external suppliers of resources; as implementors of procedure for internal allocation of resources and control of activities; and as coordinators of student activities and curriculum in helping students become oriented to college requirements, standards, and opportunities. Reasons for the growth in staff training activities include such suggestions as a new sense of management accountability. The variety of development and training activities is assessed and the lack of such programs in colleges and universities is explored. Three issues that need to be addressed in order to prepare for the 1980's are: the need for change in training curricula; the need for change in the populations to whom training is offered; and the need for change in the sponsors of staff development programs. Five recommendations for college and university presidents to consider are presented, and four suggestions for middle managers themselves, such as to be visible, are provided. Results of a survey of 62 administrators are appended. An approximately 80-item bibliography is included. (PHE)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED179143

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Robert  
Scott*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENCE:  
ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS AND TRAINING  
GOALS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Robert A. Scott  
Cornell University

To Appear as a Chapter in Staff Development:  
Perspectives for the 1980's, a Book Published  
Jointly by Illinois State University and the  
University of Lancaster (U.K.), 1979.

CS6 1103A

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENCE: ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS  
AND TRAINING GOALS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION\*

by

Robert A. Scott

Cornell University

Introduction

The growth of collegiate administration, especially in middle-management positions, has been discussed many times (Bess and Lodahl, 1969; Brown, 1969; Knapp, 1969; Baldrige, et al., 1978; Scott, 1978c). In the short span of time from the mid-1960's to the early 1970's, current fund expenditures by colleges and universities for administration increased by more than 30%, while expenditures for instruction increased by only 10% (Mertin, 1969, 1974); and this was during a period when enrollments nearly doubled (Thompson, 1970). The signs are that this growth has continued during the recent "steady-state" period (Scott, 1977a).

This chapter is concerned with the demand, supply, sponsorship, and need for staff development and training activities for these new and aging middle-level collegiate

---

\*The research on which this chapter is based was supported by the Exxon Education Foundation.

administrators. The increasing numbers of these officials and the rising cost of administration make it an area we need to know more about if we are to offer proper accountability to constituents, limit "bureaucratic" growth, and achieve effective administrative organizations. Questions discussed include: What staff development and training activities for collegiate middle-managers are currently available? What new areas of training and development are desired by middle-level administrators? How should older staff be trained for new responsibilities and how will staff be trained and retrained in the future? Who should sponsor training?

Using data gathered by a survey research questionnaire and structured interviews with education association executives, nearly two hundred administrators and faculty at twenty colleges and universities of different sizes and types, and an extensive review of literature, this writer examined the causes of growth, elaboration, and differentiation in middle-level collegiate administration; the role dimensions and conflicts, status, and values of incumbents; and the availability of professional development and training activities for mid-level administrators as currently desired and as required in the future (Scott, 1978c, 1978d). This research provides the foundation for the chapter.

Basically, these administrators fulfill three functions. They serve as liaison with external suppliers of

resources, be they financial, matériel, or human; they implement procedures for internal allocation of resources and control of activities, especially in matters of campus coordination and compliance with external requirements; and they work with student activities and curricular responsibilities in helping students become oriented to college requirements, standards, and opportunities. In each of these areas, new demands for accountability and limits to expansion imposed by a decline in financing have made it necessary to offer new forms of training to help middle-managers in their work. A new emphasis on effective administration adds to these pressures (Gross, 1976).

As collegiate organizations change in formal authority structure from a "leader-dominate" form, to a form based on tradition, to a rational-legal form, new requirements are forced on those charged with administration (Blau, 1973. For an interesting view of this process of change, see Jacobs, 1977). The processes by which these new requirements are mastered vary by institutional setting, but two constants exist. In each case, there are both institutional and individual imperatives. Some training and development activities are sponsored to meet organizational needs, and others are offered more to meet individual desires for improvement than for reasons of organization effectiveness.

### Why Staff Development and Training?

Efforts related to organizational needs are likely to be concerned, first, with a desire for an "effective administration," i.e., one which comprises goal formulation, goal attainment, resource acquisition, and membership satisfaction (Genova, et al., 1976). A second concern is the manner in which these activities are carried out and the influence on this institutional behavior of presidential or leadership style (Brooks, 1973, p. 432; Henderson and Henderson, 1974, p. 20; Richardson, 1975, p. 306; and Baumgartel, 1976, p. 23). And third, federal and state, as well as corporate trustee, requirements for administrative accountability in academic, financial, and personnel matters carry such severe sanctions that presidents are well-advised to be concerned about how campus authorities conduct their business. Colleges and universities are under enormous pressure to change from being like private, family-owned companies dominated by relatives to become more like publicly held corporations, and accountable for their actions (Scott, 1978a).

Since middle-level collegiate administration is really an extension of the president because he or she cannot possibly answer all inquiries and make all decisions, it is therefore necessary for the president to be concerned about the professional health and condition of his subordinate officers (Bess and Lodahl, 1969; Thomas, 1978). The manner in which they conduct their affairs

will affect his relations with faculty and outside groups. His ability to control the growth of administration will depend upon his knowledge of it. For reasons of organizational effectiveness, he must be concerned about the ability of his staff to meet specific, usually technical, requirements. However, there is not much evidence that higher education institutions sponsor training for these needs.

Another demand is for training and staff development that fulfills individual needs for recognition, desire, and job requirements. Collegiate middle-managers want to learn, be challenged, and be appreciated. Programs of staff development can help meet these diverse individual needs. The motives for wanting training are revealed in responses to questions about incentives for improving skills. Middle-level administrators list job security, personal advancement, keeping up with the complexities of the job, personal growth and satisfaction, salary increases, peer recognition, and personal pride (Scott, 1978b).

When one asks about incentives for gaining increased competence that should be offered, he learns that high on the list are internal mobility, job rotation, and institutional support for staff development programs. Some respondents mention "performance evaluation," which is the chief, formal way of measuring the competence and performance of those who manage (Anderson, 1975; Dressel,

1976; Genova, et al., 1976). These different demands for training and development can be complementary, but often are not. [See the appendix for a selection of questions and answers about training and development programs taken from an intensive survey questionnaire (Scott, 1978d).]

Presidents and other senior administrators say they want well-trained, competent, highly motivated staff who, like research faculty, are "self-starters." But similar incentives--e.g., paid leaves of absence, tenure, and adequate resources--are not provided (Bowen, 1978). Few institutions do more than provide funds for travel to association meetings as a form of professional development. It is not unusual to hear a college president say that support for training is not important: after all, there is no mobility in college administration, and, therefore, no need to commit hardpressed budget dollars to training; there is a constant supply of recent graduates and faculty who either have been denied tenure or who wish to move out of their studies into administration; and, finally, administrators with a desire to learn will, on their own, find the courses they need. In fact, the training given most support by institutions is for new deans and other senior executives, and for secretaries, clerks, and technicians. The former is sponsored by national associations, the latter by institutions themselves (Scott, 1978c).

While most staff development activities have been directed toward teachers, and there is a long tradition of in-service training for elementary and secondary school teachers, we have witnessed in recent years a growth in the number of training and development opportunities for collegiate administrators. These follow closely behind programs for college faculty. Charles Fisher, director of the Institute for College and University Administrators, American Council on Education (ACE), provides an excellent brief review of this topic (June 1977c). Gaff, Festa, and Gaff (1978) offer a more extensive review of the literature on training.

Possible causes for this growth in training activities are varied. Gross (1976) and Fisher (1977c) suggest several that are corroborated by other research (Scott, 1978d).

1. A new sense of management accountability on campuses.
2. An eagerness to learn that brings many administrators to college employment in the first place.
3. The inherent relationship between administrator evaluation and training.
4. The desire to keep up with new complexities and technologies.

#### The Variety of Development and Training Activities

One career development expert, a professor of psychology at Pennsylvania State University and a consultant

to industry, argues that managers should spend twenty percent of their time keeping up to date by learning new techniques and reviewing significant old ones (Fowler, 1977a). Consultation with others in similar positions and reading are among the most frequent sources of information for professional development and new ideas for job responsibilities (Scott, 1976), but such informal means can be inefficient.

More formal opportunities are numerous, as a quick review of advertisements in almost any issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education will show. The Chronicle also publishes the annual "Calendar: A Guide to Meetings, Conventions, Seminars and Travel." A major reference is A Guide to Professional Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators published by ACE (Galloway and Fisher, 1978).

Programs vary in sponsorship, scope, and audience. Some are offered by national or regional associations; some are commercial ventures; others are in the form of institutes sponsored by universities. They range in time from a day or more to a week, and up to six weeks in length. The curriculum may be aimed at the responsibilities of a particular set of administrators, or it may emphasize institutional-level planning and decision-making. Many of the administrators studied by Scott (1978c) expressed strong interest in the topics of budgeting, accounting, computers, legal issues, and

evaluation. The program audience may include department chairmen, deans, business officers, student personnel administrators, vice presidents, or presidents.

Staff training and development in colleges and universities face severe obstacles. While military, business, and governmental employers regularly send their executives and officers to training programs, collegiate institutions do not. Consequently, many administrators lack the encouragement, budget, and time necessary to attend the programs that exist. The aura of an amateur or silent administration is still desired by many presidents and faculties (Knapp, 1969; Baldrige, et al., 1978; Scott, 1978e).

It is ironic that institutions of higher learning should devote such little effort to the training of their staffs. Hilton Hotels has a career development institute in Montreal, established in 1968, to which everyone, from housekeeper to vice-president, goes for training. Each hotel has a training budget. In addition, managers have other forms of training in different locations, and are sent to U. S. business schools (Bender, 1976). The Xerox Corporation has an international training center in Leesburg, Virginia. The 2000-acre campus has facilities for over 1000 students at a time, and a faculty-staff component of 250. Every middle-manager in the company attends the special "Managing Tasks Through People" course (Scott, 1978c).

In 1975, the nation's 7500 largest companies spent more than \$1.6 billion for in-house education for their employees. A Conference Board study also found that almost 45,000 individuals work full time on training staffs for major corporations (Fowler, 1977a; Lusterman, 1977).

Military programs may be better known. At Cornell University, which seems to attract armed service officers to its professional programs, one rarely meets a major or lieutenant who has not spent one-half to two-thirds of his military career in school. The Department of Defense spends more than \$6 billion on training and education each year. Thirty percent of the nation's servicemen and officers attend school after work hours and many more are assigned to schools. Sixty percent of the Department of Defense salary and benefit budget goes to servicemen as students (Greenberg, 1978). Federal bureau examples include the U. S. Department of Agriculture and Civil Service Commission programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Some states encourage continuing education for professionals (Hays, 1978).

Another difference between staff development in colleges and universities on the one hand, and business and the military on the other, is that the former concentrate on higher level administrators and lower-level supervisors and clerks, while the latter two cover the whole spectrum of managers.

Programs for local staff exist on many larger campuses. Some have been described in College and University Bulletin (October 1976). Such programs may include existing graduate-level course registration at reduced fees, formal degree programs in higher education administration, and sponsorship of administrators at programs off campus. Nearly 300 colleges have in-house professional development programs, many with a full-time training director. Programs sponsored include seminars and workshops in fund accounting, principles of managing, using the computer, publications, assertiveness training, effective use of time, telephone techniques, discipline and grievance procedures, handling the mail, awareness training, career planning, and transactional analysis ("Training and Development Opportunities at Cornell").

The Higher Education Management Institute is conducting a survey of the need for training among administrators, and plans to develop new programs. The results of its study should increase the number of institutions with training opportunities. However, to date they are rare in higher education. Colleges and universities have simply not yet acknowledged the value of career administration and the importance of training (Scott, 1978b).

The lack of sympathy for professional development, low salaries, and dissatisfaction with prospects for mobility (Millett, 1977) together with the low status of middle-managers on campus (Perkins, 1973), make it small wonder

that they turn to other sources of help and that administrative groups have tried to develop career support mechanisms of their own. For example, the association of college advancement officials, CASE, which is for alumni and development officers, has developed a program of competence training and certificating--they say it is not certifying--and the financial aid association has discussed doing the same (Scott, 1978c).

The CASE Certificate Program, a non-credit career improvement program, provides a permanent record of professional growth, an annual review of progress, and an opportunity to work with an experienced CASE member. The Program works at three levels of experience. A member may work toward the Functional Area Certificate, for college advancement officials with one to three years experience; the Program Management Certificate, for those with three to eight years of experience; and the Executive Management Certificate for advancement administrators with eight or more years of experience. The completion of each certificate should take at least three years and be completed within five years. The certificates are not sequential.

Financial aid administrators have also been active in developing training and evaluation programs. For an excellent review of these, see Davis and Van Dusen (1978).

One of the complaints about off-campus programs, especially commercial ventures, in addition to their cost,

time, and low correlation to retention, is that they are often rushed into production in the wake of a fad. Ryan reported on the proliferation of conferences on collective bargaining when that topic was first current. There were 300 conferences on the topic in one year, with forty in the month of October alone (Ryan, 1976, p. 6).

If collective bargaining was the topic in 1973-74, the subject for 1978 and '79 is management, especially as it concerns women. New institutes have been created to offer training in management, from one-day "whirlwind" overviews prior to national association meetings and eight-day workshops with well-known authors and consultants as instructors, to month-long seminars. Annual meetings have been devoted to the topic, and new programs such as the Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration co-sponsored by Bryn Mawr College and HERS (Higher Education Referral Service)--three and one-half weeks, \$1500--and the Institute for Administrative Advancement at the University of Wisconsin-Madison--four weeks, \$800 plus room and board--are developing good reputations. The best-known programs are those offered by ACE and by Harvard.

The Institute for College and University Administrators of the American Council on Education was established at Harvard in 1955 and moved to ACE ten years later. By 1976, some 5000 administrators from 1200 colleges and universities had participated in its various week-long institutes for senior institutional officers (Fisher, 1977c).

The Harvard University Institute for Educational Management, a six-week-long program which started in 1970, enrolls about 120 senior-level administrators each summer. The fee totals nearly \$3000. Its curriculum covers the topics of academic personnel policy and administration, control and planning systems, educational policy and ethics, evaluation, governmental relations, labor relations, law and higher education, management information systems, managing financial resources, organizational design and decision-making.

Other institutes are sponsored by associations, such as the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education's week-long summer programs in executive management, communications, educational fund-raising, and alumni administration. Fees for these vary from \$385 for CASE members to \$600 for non-members. Most associations, both occupational and institutional, offer workshops and seminars for the professional development of their members. And it is these "invisible colleges" that come closest to meeting the needs of the majority of middle-level collegiate administrators (Boulding, 1975, p. 8; Willingham, 1970). Most of the others are consciously aimed at faculty members, women, or senior officers. They are not designed for developing the technical and managerial competence of middle-managers.

A little known form of staff development may be found in a publication of the National Center for Public Service

Internship Programs. Its directory lists opportunities for the "graduate, post-graduate and mid-career professional." Internships are located in business schools, government agencies, universities, and numerous other places of employment and training. One of the newest to include educational administrators is the President's Executive Interchange Program. However, such programs are beyond the reach of most administrators because their institutions do not offer leaves of absence for training.

Higher Education has not yet realized its responsibility for the professional development of its middle-level staffs. But this is not for lack of good ideas. Charles Fisher of ACE has proposed a National Academy for Leadership Development in Post Secondary Education (1977b), a cooperative, national academy "that is both a conference/training/learning center and a professional development program . . ." The Academy would help consolidate and improve the confusing array of often duplicated programs, some of which, he argues, are of dubious quality (1977c, p. 5). Students and faculty would represent the broad array of higher education's constituents. The idea of such an academy is not a new one, but it is not yet a reality, in part because staff development in colleges is not considered a part of organizational development (Richardson, 1975). Nor is it clear that organizational development is valued by campuses (Lindquist, 1977). In fact, the state of academic staff development in the U. S. is a reflection of the

status and regard of administrators on campus, which has been discussed elsewhere (Scott, 1978c).

Three Issues for the 1980's.

Three issues deserve further treatment if we are adequately to prepare for the 1980's: The need for change in training curricula; the need for change in the populations to whom training is offered; and the need for change in the sponsors of staff development programs.

At present, most programs available are of three general types: (1) those sponsored by institutional associations for carefully selected faculty chosen for senior administrative positions; (2) those sponsored by middle-managers' occupational associations for their members; and (3), those sponsored by institutions for their employees. The first type may be as much "prestige-conferring" as actually helpful in training for specific skills (Kanter and Wheatley, n.d.; see also Baumgartel, 1976). The second type, offered by national occupational associations, ranges from one-hour workshops at the time of annual meetings to sessions several weeks in length, but they emphasize technical competence. The third type, offered by home institutions, seems to be oriented to non-exempt supervisors and to emphasize the "affective" domain; they include courses such as transactional analysis and getting along with others ("Training and Development Opportunities at Cornell"). Scott (1978c) reports that supervisors and managers at all levels want more training in technical content

areas such as budgeting, accounting, and managing. In addition, training curricula will have to be expanded to include new areas of expertise required by top administrators. Colleges and universities are limited in how much they can grow and in the extent to which they can afford consultants. Therefore, institutions will have to train current employees for new expertise in areas such as pensions, equal pay laws, safety requirements, and other matters of government regulation if they are to change the trend toward growth in administration.

It is interesting to note that the literature on staff development includes so little on the subject of "orientation." It seems to be assumed that all new staff members understand the mission, nature, organization, and governance structure of a college or university. But that cannot be true. The rapid growth of staff is occurring not in the traditional "academic" areas of advising and registration, but in new areas adopted from industry--personnel, data processing, planning, finance, and business affairs. Neither these positions nor the incumbents share a collegiate tradition. And it is in these areas that many tensions develop between faculty and staff (Scott, 1978c). Shattock (1970, p. 181) suggests such an orientation course--a form of socialization to the organization--for British universities, and it should be considered by U. S. institutions as well.

These proposed changes in training curricula assume a concomitant change in those who are trained. At present,

training opportunities are limited, generally, to non-exempt staff, specially selected middle-managers, and newly-appointed senior staff. But the biggest needs are represented by veteran middle-managers. First, this is the group that must master new forms of administrative complexity. They are the ones who face the challenges from federal and state financial aid program regulations, revised minimum wage levels for student and non-student employees, new retirement and pension benefit rules, due process and equal employment opportunity standards, and other changes due to inflation and special circumstances that affect both the national and the special markets that provide services for higher education.

And second, this is the group that faces the possibility of substantial career disappointment as they come to face the prospects of limited mobility, pay, and status (Bowen, 1978; Scott, 1978c. This is also a concern in British institutions; see Moodie and Eustace, 1974, p. 157). When interviewing collegiate middle-managers, it is not uncommon to find a director of an office who has served for twenty years or more in the same position, during which time his office's responsibilities have grown and expanded. In like manner, the whole administrative organization of the college has grown more complex and added layers of administration. A variation of the "Peter Principle" takes place: the person appointed as head of a small service office stays as its head even while it grows

in size and complexity; the skill's required change, but the same person remains as director. It is not uncommon to find that the director of an office is due to retire after 30 years as its head and the assistant has been second in charge for 15 years (Scott, 1978c). There are several issues highlighted by such an example, not the least of which is loyalty, or organizational commitment. Career paths and mobility are others.

The longevity of office directors can serve to retard even further the already limited internal mobility of junior officers in the relatively flat organization structures of colleges (Scott, 1975). Thomas (1978) and Bess and Lodahl (1969) refer to the slight turnover of middle-managers, but these conclusions are probably influenced by their samples: they surveyed heads of offices. Scott (1978c) asked department heads about turnover among subordinates, and association officials about turnover among members. His conclusion is that assistants and associates change positions much more frequently than directors, and that such attrition is costly to institutions.

The literature on the organizational commitment of collegiate administrators is sparse. Thomas (1978) provides an excellent summary and analysis of what is known and contributes to the field with findings from his research. He cites Lodahl and Kejner (1965) and Buchanan (1974, p. 340), who define job involvement as the degree to which a person's work performance affects self-esteem, identification

with organizational mission, a sense of involvement in one's organizational duties, and commitment to remain with the organization. Pay and status have been examined by Baumgartel (1976), Thomas (1978), and Scott (1978c).

The needs for mid-career training and job satisfactions have been discussed extensively (see, for example, Bess and Lodahl, 1969; Solmon and Tierney, 1977; and Flint, 1978). We must think not only about who is to be trained, but why they are to be trained.

This concern leads naturally to the third issue, i.e., who should sponsor training and development activities? At present, associations offer most such opportunities with little influence from institutions. (It is true, of course, that past participants advise association sponsors, but they usually do so as individuals, not as institutional spokesmen.) While it is impressive that 300 colleges and universities have training programs, many with full-time directors, they represent fewer than 10% of all collegiate institutions in the U. S. and this is not an area of growth. It seems reasonable to assume that national associations and their agents will continue to provide members with opportunities for training, keeping up to date, guidance, direction, recognition, colleague-ship, and rewards.

It is possible, however, that new campus concerns may influence local action on behalf of training. Equal employment opportunity rules and new retirement legislation

may inspire interest in training as a concomitant to performance evaluation. Government officials and trustees are already, directly and indirectly, asking administrators to be accountable for their decisions. Faculty members, both locally and through national groups, play a significant role in policy formation and administration, and demand of college administrators "a consideration and an accountability significantly different from that required by . . . managers" in other organizations. They are, in a sense, asking for more formal appraisals of administrators, a check on quality control (New York Times, December 25, 1977), which can lead to an increased interest in formal training. Students also demand that administrators be accountable and subjected to formal evaluation (Anderson, 1975, p.4). Last, but not least, administrators themselves ask for evaluation as a form of feedback and recognition. In each case, training for improvement can be a result, because evaluation and development are two sides of the same coin (Fisher, 1977a, 1977c).

The foregoing notwithstanding, it seems probable that associations will continue to provide most training opportunities. They have the experience and a kind of momentum. They are dedicated to "encourage excellence and creative leadership," to give members "continuing opportunity for professional contact, expression, and growth," and to "cultivate professional attitudes, ideals, and standards" (NACUBO, 1976, p. 38; Scott, 1978c). Professional development training is an important part of

their purpose, and is unlikely to diminish in importance. The opposite is true in colleges and universities. Staff development for administrators is not considered a central function, and as budgets are trimmed, it is even less likely to find support. This is not to say it is unimportant; it just seems unlikely that proposals such as that by DeHart (1977) for a comprehensive and integrated management development program on each campus will be a reality soon. The limitations of money, time, encouragement, and motivation are severe, and suggest that staff development in the future will continue to rely on association activities and individual initiative.

#### Recommendations for Presidents to Consider

Nevertheless, one can formulate recommendations about training and development for presidents and provosts, and for collegiate middle-managers, to consider. Granted that there are limits to the amount of change that can be expected in the attitudes of senior administrators toward training, much can be done to contribute to both job satisfaction for the individual and effective administration for the institution. Scott (1978c) formulates for presidents and provosts five areas of suggestion which are based on a need for organizational development and a concern for the value of what is known as human capital (See also Kerr, 1972).

1. Make use of what is known about job satisfaction and organizational commitment (See especially

Bess and Lodahl, 1969; Ingraham with King (1968); Braude 1975, pp. 36-96; Maccoby, 1976; Richardson, 1976; Sheppard and Herrick, 1972; and Solmon and Tierney, 1977). Develop incentives that reinforce major job satisfactions, e.g., opportunities to help students and staff, to act independently, and to make an impact on the organization, job security and advancement, professional growth, salary increases, and peer recognition (Scott, 1978c), and programs that deal with areas of frustration such as lack of staff, poor work space, paperwork, and lack of recognition and appreciation for their work (Ingraham with King, 1968; Perkins, 1973).

2. Provide mechanisms of feedback to middle-managers about their successes and shortcomings. Most people need external stimuli and reactions to help develop feelings of self-esteem, satisfaction, and mastery (Bucher and Stelling, 1977; for comments on the function of high expectations, see Price, 1977, p. 37). Make sure that middle-management jobs have opportunities for success, professional growth, training, and an adequate salary structure. Presidents say they want "self-starters" and compare administrators to faculty. But they do not provide similar environmental conditions, rewards, and incentives.

3. Be concerned about the environment for innovation. Many administrators see their organizations as relatively constraining. They find there is little expectation that they will try out new ideas; they feel they have little or no freedom to set their own personal performance goals; top management shows little "consideration" for middle-managers; and communication is not "free" and "open" (Baumgartel, 1976, pp. 32 and 33). Demonstrate an attitude of interest in how new development can help (Kerr, op. cit., p.22; Price, op. cit. p. 38). An atmosphere of trust and respect is required to foster the confidence needed for effective problem solving by mid-level staff (Maccoby, 1978).
4. Recognize the value to the individuals and to the organization of broad participation in goal-setting activities. This is an imperative in the development of professional identity, integration, and commitment. In McClelland's terms, people have the need to achieve, the need for affiliation, and the need to assume a major (not necessarily a dominant) role in the organization (1961). Encourage the development of administrative councils and similar structures (Scott, 1978c). Consider new dimensions to the roles of middle-managers. In Britain, for example, collegiate

middle-managers seem to have a more central role and are accorded much more dignity than in either Canada or the U. S. We can learn by studying new methods of career development and organization, and the role of British administrators in institutional decision-making (Greenaway, 1977).

5. Encourage career alternatives and mobility within your organization. Because expectations are low and administrative structures flat, there is no tradition for internal mobility in administration. Now, concern for professional growth and mobility runs against concern for Affirmative Action, which is often interpreted as allowing promotion only within specified career ladders. But on most campuses, career ladders are either non-existent or very short. For example, if there is a four-person office of admissions and a one-person office of financial aid that needs a new director, it should be possible to appoint to that position a bright admissions officer who may leave the college because he or she wants and deserves new professional challenges and rewards. The dilemma of internal mobility and local Affirmative Action requirements for the widespread advertising of positions is of such magnitude that it requires special attention.

It has been shown that middle-managers want to learn, be challenged, and be appreciated. Most do not regard upward mobility as their prime goal. The opportunity for new challenges, even in short-term or "task force" assignments, and significant contributions of effort toward the achievement of campus goals are equally important. Renewed attention must be given to collegiate organizational structure and the degree of mobility--both upward and especially lateral--possible within them. Job rotation and sabbatical leave programs should be adopted. Middle-managers may even be able to contribute to the development of new curricula in areas of interest to students.

Only by understanding the roles, functions, and needs of middle-level administrators, and by making the best use of them as extensions of the presidency, will colleges and universities be able to exercise some control over the rise of administrative costs and get, as one Senior Vice-President put it, "more bang for the buck." (For an analysis of the effects of federal compliance requirements on the expansion of administrative positions and the increase in staff costs, see Scott, 1978a, which concludes that these forms of growth result more from institutional behavior and style than from regulations alone.)

#### What Can Middle-Managers Do for Themselves?\*

It seems clear that there is little evidence that

---

\*Parts of this section are adopted from Scott, 1978c.

colleges and universities will change soon--i.e., that on their own, presidents will encourage and support staff development and demonstrate concern for the professional "health" of middle-level administrators.

"Organizations tend to be designed to minimize ambiguity," which limits the potential for challenging new experiences (Argyris, 1972). But people have the capacity to grow, and, in general, "the more they orient themselves toward growth, the better (it is) for organizational health" (*ibid.*).

If presidents will not propose change, who will? The faculty? Students? Maybe the trustees. And maybe government in its several forms. But perhaps middle-managers should first. After all, they are part of the situation. In most cases, middle-managers have the capacity to develop and propose changes in the incentives and training available to improve both competence and performance. This is the "frontier" model of staff development: do it yourself.

Much can be done from below in an organization, if the right attitudes exist. In the words of Harlan Cleveland (1974, p. 31) there is a set of attitudes which are indispensable to the management of complexity:

--The notion that crises are normal, tensions are promising, and complexity is fun;

- The understanding that paranoia and self-pity are reserved for nonexecutives;
- The conviction that there must be some more upbeat outcome than would result from the sum of available expert advice; and
- A sense of personal responsibility for the situation as a whole.

The effective administrator is one who can deal with ambiguity, achieve consensus, possess a "can do" spirit unwarranted by expert predictions, and have a willingness to take initiative and let others take the credit (Cleveland, 1977, pp. 23, 24).

Since these attitudes already exist in large measure among middle-managers, the next steps for growth seem within reach. It is up to them to make the first move.

Some specific first moves are these: First, be visible. Participate in the educational life of the college. Be active in committee work and advising; eat with the faculty. Work with departments and deans. Keep them informed about your work and ideas for theirs. Distribute reports widely; keep your faculty informed about national developments in curricula, placement testing, and trends in enrollment. For example, if you are a personnel officer, when was the last time you offered to help a dean plan for the impact of an increase in the minimum wage on next year's budget? When was the last time you offered to review that recent TIAA-CREF mailing at a faculty

meeting? When did you last offer to help a new dean or department chairperson understand the employment regulations that will affect him or her? Sure, he has a career administrator or a seasoned aide, but who is sure that he knows (Scott, 1977b). With the help of others, start an administrative council or similar organization for discussion and proposals concerning the educational and work environment of the institution (Scott 1978c).

Second, develop and demonstrate skills in forecasting, planning, and budgeting. Know the literature of higher education; know where to find studies that will help your work and that of your colleagues and faculty committees. Become familiar with the resources of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Third, analyze your institution's structure and propose paths for professional and intellectual development. In addition to courses and degrees, look into exchanges with departments on your own and other campuses. A great deal can be learned by doing your own job in a different setting and by applying your skills to special, short-term projects. Identify possible promotion patterns in the organization and suggest them to your senior administrators.

Almost every college has faculty in accounting, sociology, and psychology qualified to teach courses in managerial and fund accounting, organizational behavior, and communication. These are areas of need expressed by

middle-managers, and such work could be offered in short courses on campuses at little expense. But someone has to propose and organize them.

Administrative departments should be encouraged to visit, en masse, equivalent staffs at nearby colleges. Exchange visits. It is amazing how helpful it can be to spend just one day in another institution's shop. Your staff will learn two useful things: some new ideas, and how good their own ideas are (Scott, 1975).

There is a tendency for middle-managers and others in bureaucratic positions to specialize intensively to make themselves ever more proficient and indispensable. Kanter (1978) discusses this as part of the "opportunity problem" in large-scale organizations. To consider a short-term job in a different context is a foreign thought. Actually, beyond a certain plateau, it is the administrator's imagination and talents for thinking, written and oral expression, and organization, not his knowledge of a particular field, that are important both for effectiveness and continued growth.

Fourth, demonstrate your professionalism; don't ask for status. Faculty rank and special voting privileges for full-time, non-teaching administrative officers are "red herrings" that probably will do more to alienate the people you wish to influence than to enhance your status. Faculty status alone does not bring respect. Ideas and accomplishments do (Scott, 1975).

Conclusion

Scott (1978c) reports that he was enormously impressed by many of the middle-managers he interviewed. They had achieved their status almost in spite of their institutions, or at least without conscious institutional support. They suffer and yet they prosper. They have a high degree of institutional loyalty, but must look off campus, mostly to their associations, for training, guidance, recognition, collegueship, and rewards. They are optimistic: not because they believe things will get better, but that they will get better and rise to meet the new needs.

With the growing complexity of institutional organization and the continued need for new kinds of expert knowledge, together with the fact that opportunities for mobility are becoming increasingly uncertain at a time when job security for middle-managers is improving (especially through the expansion of "due process" and "equal protection" coverage in personnel matters), it is important for institutions to commit resources and become more active in the development and sponsorship of training programs. They cannot rely so greatly on national associations and individual initiative if they are to help solve future problems. Such a commitment to campus training efforts would not only be symbolically important to university staffs, but could provide the funds necessary to satisfy both institutional needs for competence and efficiency and individual

needs for challenge and encouragement. Only with this kind of commitment can there be congruence in administrative needs and training goals in American higher education.

# APPENDIX

In addition to interviewing more than two hundred administrators, Scott (1978d) surveyed a sample of them with an extensive questionnaire. Sixty-two of ninety responded. The following is a selection of questions and answers. Percentages do not always total 100%.

1. Do you think college and university administration would be improved if there were formal and university courses for preparation, internship programs for on-the-job training, or other forms of staff development and training?

|         |     |
|---------|-----|
| Yes     | 60% |
| No      | 18% |
| Perhaps | 8%  |

2. Who should sponsor such programs?

|                                                  |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Home campus                                      | 35% |
| Regional or national association of institutions | 34% |
| National association professional groups         | 35% |

3. Have you taken any special courses, workshops, seminars, etc., which you have found especially helpful in your work?

|     |     |
|-----|-----|
| Yes | 66% |
| No  | 15% |

4. What subjects did you find most helpful? Which would you like to take:

Courses and workshops in all facets of management and in government regulations were the most common responses to both questions.

5. Who sponsored the program(s) you participated in?

A national occupational association was by far the most common response.

6. Does your institution have a training or development program for administrators?

|     |     |
|-----|-----|
| Yes | 18% |
| No  | 73% |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, G. Lester (1975). The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Argyris, Chris (1972). "A Few Words in Advance." In The Failure of Success, edited by Alfred J. Marrow, p. 7. New York: American Management Association, Inc.
- Baldrige, J. Victor, David V. Curtis, George Ecker, and Gary L. Riley (1978). Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Baumgartel, Howard (1976). "Evaluation of Management Development Efforts in the University Setting: Problems, Programmes, and Research Model," New Frontiers in Education (Delhi).
- Bender, Marylin (1976). "Hilton International: Enforcing Standards," New York Times, July 23: D3.
- Bess, James L., and Thomas M. Lodahl (1969). "Career Patterns and Satisfactions in University Middle-Management," Educational Record, Spring: 220-229.
- Elau, Peter M. (1973). The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Boulding, Kenneth E. (1975), "The Management of Decline," AGB Reports 17,8: 4-9.
- Bowen, Howard R. (1978). Academic Compensation: Are Faculty and Staff in American Higher Education Adequately Paid? New York: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association--College Retirement Equities Fund.

- Braude, Lee (1975). Work and Workers: A Sociological Analysis. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Brooks, Glenn E. (1973). "Administrative Modernization in British Universities," Universities Quarterly, Autumn: 431-456.
- Brown, J. Douglas (1969). The Liberal University, An Institutional Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Buchanan, Bruce, II (1974). "Government Managers, Business Executives, and Organizational Commitment," Public Administration Review, 339-347.
- Bucher, Rue, and Joan G. Stelling (1977). Becoming Professional. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- CASE Certificate Program Brochure.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education (October 3, 1977). "Calendar of Meetings, Conventions, and Seminars in Academic 1977-78": 19n.
- Cleveland, Harlan (1974). Seven Everyday Collisions in American Higher Education. New York: International Council for Educational Development.
- . (1977). "The Education of Administrators for Higher Education." Fourth David D. Henry Lecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois, April 13-14.
- College and University Bulletin (October 1976).
- Davis, Jerry S., and William D. Van Dusen (1978). Guide to the Literature of Student Financial Aid. New York: The College Board.

- DeHart, A. Robert (1977). "The Continuing Education of Administrators," Developing Staff Potential, Terry O'Banion, editor. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers (Number 198, Volume V, Autumn, 1977, New Directions for Community Colleges).
- Dressel, Paul L. (1976). Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Fisher, Charles F. (1977a). "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators," Part One, ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, March.
- . (1977b). "Proposal of a Working Idea . . . A National Academy for Leadership Development in Postsecondary Education." Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, April. Mimeographed.
- . (1977c). "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators, Part Two: Professional Development of Administrators," ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, June.
- Flint, Jerry (1978). "Oversupply of Young Workers Expected to Tighten Jobs Race," New York Times, June 25: 1, 34.
- Fowler, Elizabeth (1977a). "In-House Education by Companies," New York Times, June 10.
- . (1977b). "The Obsolescence of Professionals," New York Times, June 24: DS.
- Gaff, Sally Shake, Conrad Festa, and Jerry G. Gaff (1978). Professional Development: A Guide to Resources. New York: Change Magazine Press.

- Galloway, Sylvania W., and Charles F. Fisher (1978). A Guide to Professional Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators 1978. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Genova, William J., Marjorie K. Madoff, Robert Chin, and George B. Thomas (1976). Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Greenaway, Harriet K. (1977). "The Role of the Registrar in Academic Government--Some Contrasts Between Canada and Britain," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 7 (2): 67-71.
- Greenberg, Irv (1978). Remarks made at the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, April 24.
- Gross, Richard F. (1976). "Growth Contracts for Administrators." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 7-10. Mimeographed.
- Hays, Samuel H., Director, Public Executive Project, State University of New York at Albany. Letter to the author, November 1, 1978.
- Henderson, Algo, and Jean G. Henderson (1974). Higher Education in America: Problems, Priorities, Prospects. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ingraham, Mark, with Francis P. King (1968). The Mirror of Brass: The Compensation and Working Conditions of

College and University Administrators. Madison:

The University of Wisconsin Press.

Jacobs, James B. (1977). Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, and Margaret J. Wheatley (n.d.).

"Career Development for Women in Academic Administration: The Role of Training." Summary of Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. (1978). "The Opportunity Problem," AAHE Bulletin, June: 4, 10.

Kerr, Clark (1972). "The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict." First David D. Henry Lecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, October 10-11, pp. 19ff.

Knapp, David C. (1969). "Management: Intruder in the Academic Dust," Educational Record, 50, 1: 55-59.

Lindquist, Jack (1977). "Administrative Development for Organization Development," paper presented at the CASC-AAHE Conference entitled, "Running Higher Education," Airlie House, Virginia, February 3.

Lodahl, Thomas W., and Mathilde Kejner (1965). "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement," Journal of Applied Psychology, 49 (1): 24-33.

Lusterman, Seymour (1977). Education in Industry. New York: The Conference Board.

- Maccoby, Michael (1976). The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- . (1978). "Trust is Also the Business of Business," The New York Times, March 31: A27.
- McClelland, David (1961). The Achieving Society. New Jersey: Van Nostrand.
- Mertin, Paul F. (1969, 1974). Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education: Current Funds, Revenues and Expenditures. Washington, D.C: USOE, U. S. Printing Office.
- Millett, John D. (1977). Interview, June 17.
- Moodie, Graeme C., and Rowland Eustace (1974). Power and Authority in British Universities. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.
- NACUBO (1976). The College and University Interassociation Related Group Profile. November.
- NASFAA (1978). Characteristics and Attitudes of the Financial Aid Administrator. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.
- New York Times, (December 25, 1977). "It's a Different Yale, as A New Blue Takes Over," E7.
- Perkins, James A., editor (1973). The University As An Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Price, William C. (1977). "Effective Middle Management in Higher Education," College and University, Fall: 37n.

- Richardson, Elliot (1976). The Creative Balance: Government, Politics, and the Individual in America's Third Century. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Richardson, Richard C., Jr. (1975). "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework," Journal of Higher Education, XLVI, 3: 302-312.
- Ryan, J. H. (1976). "Continuing Education for College and University Administrators, or Improving Management Capacity for the Prisoner of Higher Education." Paper presented to the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, Chicago. Mimeographed.
- Scott, Robert A. (1975). "Middle-Management on Campus: Training Ground or Wasteland." NACAC Journal, 20, 1: 38-40.
- . (1976). "What Do Admissions Officers Read? Sources of Information for Professional Development and Effectiveness." NACAC Journal, 20,3: 22-27
- . (1977a). "Middle-Level Collegiate Administration in a Period of Retrenchment," College and University, 53, 1: 42-56.
- . (1977b). "Misdirected Missionaries: Personnel Officers in Academe." Speech presented at the Annual Meeting of the College and University Personnel Association, October 17. Cincinnati, Ohio. Mimeographed.
- . (1978a). "More Than Greenbacks and Red Tape: The Hidden Costs of Government," Change Magazine, April: 18-23.

- . (1978b). "Yeast for the Yeomen, Sauce for the Squires: Incentives for Improving Administrative Competence and Performance." Paper presented at the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, Chicago, April 24. Mimeographed.
  - . (1978c). Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle-Managers and Their Organizations. Washington, D.C.: AAHE/ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
  - . (1978d). Report to the Exxon Education Foundation on a study of the effects of federal regulations on college and university costs, operations, and administrative organizations.
  - . (1978e). "The 'Amateur' Dean in A Complex University: An Essay on Role Ambiguity." Paper presented at the Ontario (Toronto) Institute for Studies in Education Conference on Deans as Individuals in Organizations, University of Toronto, November 5-7.
- Shattock, Michael L. (1970). "Training University Administrators." The British Council.
- Sheppard, Harold L., and Neal Q. Herrick (1972). Where Have All the Robots Gone? Worker Dissatisfaction in the 70's. New York: Free Press.
- Solmon, Lewis C., and Michael Tierney (1977). "Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among College Administrators," Journal of Higher Education XLVIII, 412-431.
- Thomas, Gerald S. (1978). Organizational Commitment: Sources and Implications for the Development of Middle Managers. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

Thompson, Ronald B. (1970) Projections of Enrollments, Public and Private Colleges and Universities, 1970-1987. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, December: 5.

"Training and Development Opportunitites at Cornell."

Training and Development Section, University Personnel Services, Cornell University. Brochure.

Willingham, Warren W. (1970). Professional Development of Financial Aid Officers. Higher Education Surveys Report No. 2. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.